

REMARKS

The final Office Action dated May 17, 2004 and the Advisory Action dated October 14, 2004 have been received and carefully considered. In conformance with the applicable statutory requirements, this Amendment constitutes a complete reply and/or a bona fide attempt to advance the application to allowance.

In accordance with the suggestions of the Examiner, Claims 7 and 11 have been amended and detailed arguments in support of patentability are presented.

Claims 1, 6, 8 and 13-16 have been cancelled.

The applicant believes that this application is now in condition for allowance and early notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-6, 13, 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kuzunuki et al (US 6,266,057).

Claims 8-10, 12, 15 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuzunuki et al (US 6,266,057) in view of Wilson et al (US 6,278,479).

Claims 7 and 11 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Summary of the Interview and Prosecution History since Final Office Action

A proposed Amendment After Final Office Action was submitted on July 9, 2004. The proposed Amendment included amendments to claims 1, 7, 11 and 13. The applicant amended claims 1 and 13 to include the feature of calculating a three-dimensional position in real space of a movable real object. With respect to claims 7 and 11, the applicant amended the claims in accordance with the above suggestions of the Examiner. None of the amendments included in the proposed Amendment After Final was entered, including the proposed amendments to claims 7 and 11. Instead, an Advisory Action was mailed on October 14, 2004 indicating that the proposed amendments "raise new issues that requires further search and consideration."

On November 15, 2004, a telephonic interview was initiated by Examiner Mehrdad Dastouri in response to a phone message left by applicant's representative

relative to the Advisory Action, the substance of the interview is incorporated herein. In the interview, no specific prior art was discussed and no exhibits were shown, nor were any demonstrations conducted. The Examiner suggested that the applicant cancel the rejected independent claims and rewrite the objected to claims in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner further suggested that applicant's representative prepare this second Amendment After Final Office Action for purposes of advancing the application to a Notice of Allowance.

**The Claims Distinguish Patentability
Over the Reference(s) of Record**

Claim 7, which was previously indicated as containing allowable subject matter, has been placed in independent form to include all the features of base claim 1 and intervening claim 6. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 7 and claims 2-5 dependent therefrom distinguish patentably and unobviously over the references of record.

Claim 11, which was previously indicated as containing allowable subject matter, has been placed in independent form to include all the features of base claim 8. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 11 and claims 9, 10, 12 and 17 dependent therefrom distinguish patentably and unobviously over the references of record.

The applicant respectfully submits that the present Amendment merely adopts the Examiner's suggestions, removes issue for appeal, or in some other way, requires only a cursory review by the Examiner. The claims as amended do not raise any issues with regard to new matter, do not present new issues requiring further search or consideration and/or place the application into better for appeal. Accordingly, the Amendment should be entered and the application forwarded for issuance.

CONCLUSION

All formal and informal matter having been addressed, it is submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 2-5, 7, 9-12 and 17) are now in condition for allowance.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this Amendment After Final. However, the undersigned attorney of record hereby authorizes the charging of any

Nov. 16, 2004 11:51AM

No. 1456 P. 10
Atty. Dkt. No. D/9901
XERZ 2 00277

necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Deposit Account No. 24-0037.

In the event the Examiner believes a telephone call would clear up any minor matter, he is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FABIAN,
MINNICH & MCKEE, LLP

Nov 16, 2004
Date

Patrick R. Roche, Reg. No. 29,580
Robert A. Sidoti, Reg. No. 48,416
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582

N:\XERZ\200277\USV\sd000113\001.doc